

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 3, 10 and 18 are pending in the present application. Claims 3, 10 and 18 have been amended, and Claim 13 has been cancelled, herewith. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

I. Claim Objections

Claim 18 was objected to as containing duplicate “A method” phrases. Applicants have amended such claim to eliminate one of these duplicate phrases in order to overcome this objection.

The Examiner also requested that the phrase “identifier to a reference” be changed to “identifier to a referenced” in Claims 3, 10 and 18, and Applicants have amended such claims accordingly.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed, as Applicants have cancelled such claim herewith, without prejudice or disclaimer, such that this case can expeditiously pass to issuance. This Claim 13 will likely be pursued in a continuation application.

Therefore, rejection of Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, has been overcome.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 3, 10, 13 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In rejecting Claims 3 (and similarly for Claims 13 and 18), the Examiner notes an antecedent basis issue regarding “said reference header”. Applicants have amended Claims 3 and 18 as suggested by the Examiner. Claim 13 has been cancelled herewith, as previously described.

In further rejecting Claim 10, the Examiner notes that “the step of reconstructing said message” lacks antecedent basis. Applicants have amended such claim to correct this issue.

In further rejecting Claim 18, the Examiner has interpreted the claim to read “the receiving step comprises ~~the step of~~ receiving the message including said compressed header”. Applicants have amended such claim to comply with the Examiner’s interpretation.

In further rejecting Claims 3, 10, 13 and 18, the Examiner has interpreted the claim to read “said method comprising ~~the step of~~”. Applicants have amended such Claims 3, 10 and 18 to comply with the Examiner’s interpretation. Claim 13 has been cancelled herewith, as previously described.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 3, 10, 13 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been overcome.

IV. Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states that Claims 3, 10 and 18 would be allowable if rewritten/amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. As Applicants have amended such claims to overcome such 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection (as described above), it is urged that this case is now in condition for allowance as these are the only claims remaining in this case.

V. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: March 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Wayne P. Bailey/

Wayne P. Bailey
Reg. No. 34,289
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicant